

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 31, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Each of the issues raised in the Office Action is addressed herein.

Claims 1-30 were previously pending in this application. In this paper, claims 1, 8-10, 18-20, and 28-30 have been amended. Claims 1-30 are pending with claims 1, 11, and 21 being independent claims. No new matter has been added. The application as now presented is believed to be in allowable condition.

Interview Summary

Applicants would like to acknowledge with thanks the Examiner, Alicia Baturay, who agreed to discuss the application during a telephone interview with Edmund J. Walsh and Usman A. Khan of Wolf, Greenfield, & Sacks P.C. on Tuesday, January 29, 2008, at 10 AM.

During the conference call, the Examiner acknowledged that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art (Comstock) because Comstock does not describe "an authoritative name server" as recited in the claim. The Examiner also acknowledged that "specifying a supplementary value that ensures the current address will not be cached within non-authoritative name servers" does not read on "tunneling" as described in Comstock.

Remarks and amendments made herein may serve as a further summary of the interview.

I. Overview of the Application

As an aid to the Examiner, the Applicants provide a brief summary of the application. This summary is not intended as a substitute for the Examiner reading the application in its entirety and is not intended to characterize the claims or any terms used in the claims, which are discussed individually below.

Briefly, the present application describes a method and system that allows mobile network nodes to maintain network connectivity with a corresponding node even after the corresponding node and / or mobile node's assigned network address changes. The mobile node can change address by registering with an authoritative name server and therefore does not rely upon a home agent. In addition, by specifying a time-to-live value of zero, the mobile node can ensure that its

current address will not be cached with non-authoritative name servers, which could provide false address information.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11-13, 16, 17, 21-23, 26, and 27 (including independent claims 1, 11, and 21) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,920 (“Comstock”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

A. Discussion of Comstock

Comstock is related to the use of Mobile IP binding information to deliver mobile terminating packets between a corresponding node and a mobile node using Layer-2 tunneling. A home agent within the home network and a foreign agent is a router that performs the Mobile IP functionality (Col. 2, Lines 9-14). The home address and “care-of” address are registered with the home network (Col. 2, Lines 15-25). Comstock does not mention whether or not the address is cached elsewhere within the network or that any values are specified to either cause or prevent such caching.

B. Claim 1

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn because the claim contains limitations not met by Comstock. For example, claim 1 recites: “registering an address, for the mobile node, with an authoritative name server,” including “specifying a supplementary value that ensures the current address will not be cached with non-authoritative name servers.” In contrast, Comstock does not register an address with a name server and does not describe caching at all. During the interview, it was agreed that the passages of Comstock cited in the Office Action relate to tunneling, which does not meet the limitations of the claim. It therefore follows that Comstock does not describe either “registering an address, for the mobile node, with an authoritative name server,” or “specifying a supplementary value that ensures the current address will not be cached with non-authoritative name servers,” as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Comstock and is in condition for allowance. Therefore the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable based upon their dependency.

C. Claims 11 and 21

Applicants' claims 11 and 21 likewise include limitations that distinguish over Comstock. Specifically, claim 11 recites "registering an address, for the mobile node, with an authoritative name server" and "specifying a supplementary value that ensures the current address will not be cached within non-authoritative name servers." Claim 21 recites "registering an address, for the mobile node, with an authoritative name server," and "specifying a supplementary value that ensures the current address will not be cached within non-authoritative name servers."

As should be apparent from the foregoing discussion, claims 11 and 21 patentably distinguish over Comstock and are in condition for allowance. Therefore the rejections of claims 11 and 21 should be withdrawn. Claims 12-20 and 22-30 depend from claims 11 and 21, respectively, and are allowable based upon their dependency.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 5, 8-10, 14, 15, 18-20, 24, 25, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Comstock in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,627 ("Millet"). Millet is cited to teach a naming query. It does not teach the limitations of any of the independent claims that are not met by Comstock. Without agreeing to the characterization of Millet in the Office Action or that there is a reason to combine Comstock and Millet, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections based on Comstock and Millet be withdrawn because neither reference teaches all the limitations of the independent claims. Therefore, even if combined, the references would not teach all of the limitation of claims 4, 5, 8-10, 14, 15, 18-20, 24, 25, and 28-30, which are dependent on base claims (Independent claims 1, 11, and 21). Accordingly, the rejection of claims 4, 5, 8-10, 14, 15, 18-20, 24, 25, and 28-30 should be withdrawn.

IV. Comments on Dependent Claims

Though all of the dependent claims should be allowed because of their dependence on an allowable claim, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish over the references, providing additional reasons that these claims should be allowed.

For example, claim 6 relates to establishing a tunnel connection between the mobile node and a virtual private network server. Claim 8 elaborates that “specifying the supplementary value comprises specifying a time-to-live (TTL) value of zero.” Claim 10 elaborates that the “authoritative name server is a domain name system (DNS) server.”

Because all of the dependent claims depend from a base claim that is in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue for the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually, but reserve the right to do so later.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment set forth in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Furthermore, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify any concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: January 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Edmund J. Walsh
Registration No.: 32,950
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000